

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 19 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 13-20 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 8-11, 13-17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,252,648 to Hase *et al.* ("Hase") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,850 to Chan *et al.* ("Chan"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4 and 8 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereby rendering the rejection thereto moot.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a projection system configured to project the patterned beam onto a target portion of the substrate, wherein a space in the radiation system and/or projection system comprises a composition to remove a contaminant from a surface of the apparatus, the composition containing (a) and (b), wherein (a) is one or more perchlorinated, perbrominated, or periodinated C₁-C₆ alkanes and (b) is one or more compounds including one or more nitrogen atoms and one or more atoms selected from hydrogen, oxygen, and halogen." Applicants respectfully submit that Hase or Chan whether taken separately or in combination does not disclose all of the features of claim 1.

Neither Hase nor Chan discloses "a composition containing ... one or more perchlorinated, perbrominated, or periodinated C₁–C₆ alkanes[.]" Thus claim 1 and each claim depending therefrom are patentable over the combination of Hase and Chan.

Dependent claims 2, 9-11, and 13-17 are likewise not anticipated by the combination of Hase and Chan for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-2, 9-11, and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, "producing reactive species of a composition to remove a contaminant from a surface, wherein a space through which the beam passes comprises the composition containing (a) and (b), wherein (a) is one or more perchlorinated, perbrominated, or periodinated C₁-C₆ alkanes and (b) is one or more compounds including one or more nitrogen atoms and one or more atoms selected from hydrogen, oxygen, and halogen. Applicants respectfully submit that Hase or Chan whether taken separately or in combination does not disclose all of the features of claim 19.

Neither Hase nor Chan discloses "a composition containing ... one or more perchlorinated, perbrominated, or periodinated C₁–C₆ alkanes[.]" Thus claim 19 and each claim depending therefrom are patentable over the combination of Hase and Chan.

Dependent claim 20 is likewise not anticipated by the combination of Hase and Chan for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which it depends, and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hase in view of Chan as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 8-11, 13-17, 19-20 above, and further in view of Journal of Crystal growth 222 (2001) 452-458, McGinnis *et al.* ("McGinnis"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As explained, *supra*, amended claim 1 contains the feature of "a composition containing ... one or more perchlorinated, perbrominated, or periodinated C₁-C₆ alkanes[,] which is not disclosed by Hase or Chan. McGinnis does not overcome the deficiencies of Hase and Chan. Claims 5 and 6 depend directly from claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that since dependent claims 5 and 6 implicitly contain the elements of independent claim 1, then these claims are patentable over the combination of Hase, Chan, and McGinnis.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be removed from claims 5 and 6 and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hase in view of Chan as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 8-11, 13-17, 19-20 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,320,707 to Kanekiyo *et al.* ("Kanekiyo"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As explained, *supra*, amended claim 1 contains the feature of "a composition containing ... one or more perchlorinated, perbrominated, or periodinated C₁-C₆ alkanes[,] which is not disclosed by Hase or Chan. Kanekiyo does not overcome the deficiencies of Hase and Chan. Claim 7 depends directly from claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that since dependent claim 7 implicitly contains the elements of independent claim 1, then this claim is patentable over the combination of Hase, Chan, and Kanekiyo.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be removed from claim 7 and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hase in view Chan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,225,032 to Hasegawa *et al.* ("Hasegawa"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As explained, *supra*, amended claim 1 contains the feature of "a composition containing ... one or more perchlorinated, perbrominated, or periodinated C₁–C₆ alkanes[,] which is not disclosed by Hase or Chan. Hasegawa does not overcome the deficiencies of Hase and Chan. Claim 18 depends directly from claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that since dependent claim 18 implicitly contains the elements of independent claim 1, then this claim is patentable over the combination of Hase, Chan, and Hasegawa.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection be removed from claim 18 and that this claim be allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Glenn J. Perry
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,458

Date: 20 Nov. 2008

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

866070_2.DOC